

AD-A154 663

A STUDY OF THE SOCIAL ORGINS OF A UNITED STATES ELITE:
THE US ARMY(U) ARMY MILITARY PERSONNEL CENTER
ALEXANDRIA VA R D CHASE 25 MAR 85

1/1.

UNCLASSIFIED

F/G 5/9

NL

520

Call 800-

574



MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART
NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS-1963-A

(2)

A Study Of The Social Origins Of A United States Elite: The U.S. Army

CPT Randall D. Chase
HQDA, MILPERCEN (DAPC-OPA-E)
200 Stovall Street
Alexandria, Virginia 22332

AD-A154 663

IA Thesis 25 March 1085

DTIC
ELECTE
JUN 5 1985
S D
E

Approved for public release; unlimited distribution.

DTIC FILE COPY

A thesis submitted to The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill,
Chapel Hill North Carolina in partial fulfillment for the degree of Masters
of Arts in Sociology.

85 04 09 188

M.A. THESIS

A STUDY OF THE SOCIAL ORIGINS
OF A

UNITED STATES MILITARY ELITE: THE U.S. ARMY

by
RANDALL D. CHASE

Accession For	
NTIS GRA&I	<input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/>
DTIC TAB	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unannounced	<input type="checkbox"/>
Justification	
By	
Distribution/	
Availability Codes	
Dist	Avail and/or Special
A/1	

A Thesis submitted to the faculty of The
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in partial
fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of
Arts in the Department of Sociology

Chapel Hill

March 25, 1985

Approved by:

Rachel C. Rosenfeld

Rachel Rosenfeld
Chairperson

Richard Simpson

Richard Simpson

Michael Powell

Michael Powell

© 1985
Randall D. Chase
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

RANDALL DELAINE CHASE. A Study Of The Social Origin Of A United States Military Elite: The U.S. Army. (Under the direction of Rachel Rosenfeld.)

A review of the literature determines that little has been written about the social origins of the military elite since Morris Janowitz's book, The Professional Soldier. Chapter Five, "Social Origins", is used as the reference for this study of the Army elite of 1984. It is determined that the Army elite continues to have more homogeneous social origins than the general U.S. population.

Janowitz's prediction that the military elite will become, over time, more representative of the U.S. population has, to an extent, come true. The 1984 Army elite is more representative of the U.S. population in the areas of nativity, social class, and religious affiliation. Other characteristics of the elite, such as source of commission, parents' education and occupation, and spouses' education and occupation, are also discussed.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank my committee members Rachel Rosenfeld, Richard Simpson and Michael Powell for all their assistance. I would also wish to express my appreciation to Charles Moskos for his encouragement to return to graduate school and to Morris Janowitz for his previous work and his encouragement to follow-up his chapter on social origins. Finally my thanks to my wife Connie for her faithful support and assistance.

AUTHOR'S NOTE: The opinions and assertions herein are those of the author and are not to be construed as official or reflecting the views of the U.S. Army or Department of Defense.

Table Of Contents

I. Introduction.....	1
II. Literature Review.....	5
III. Hypothesis.....	12
IV. Research Design.....	13
Population.....	13
Data Collection.....	14
Variables and Specification.....	16
Analysis.....	19
V. Findings.....	21
Social Origins Comparison.....	21
Nativity.....	21
Geographical Background.....	22
Religion.....	24
Social Strata.....	26
Other Indicators of Social Origin and Characteristics of the Army Elite.....	28
VI. Conclusion.....	31
VII. Appendices.....	35
VIII. References.....	46

I.

INTRODUCTION

Ever since the end of World War II, the United States has maintained a large standing army. For the first time in its history, it formed a large peacetime army and made commitments to many allies which guaranteed this army a long life. By the late 1950's many people, including several sociologists, began to study the military and the effects of the military on American society. The military as a social institution received extensive analysis.

Large amounts of data and literature have been generated by this interest in the military and great gains have been made in understanding the influence of the military on society and vice versa. There have also been significant advances in understanding individual and group behavior within the military. Civil-military relations have also received intense coverage. Furthermore, the study of war itself has benefited from this increasing emphasis on studying the military as have areas of general concern such as race relations and gender roles.

Yet throughout this whole period one area has been blatantly neglected. Social stratification and social mobility within the military have not received the attention they deserve. In addition to the problem of access to information about the elites in the military, another

possible reason for neglect in this area is that the military in the United States, as a large bureaucratic organization, is supposed to use only universal criteria for selection and advancement. Therefore many sociologists may feel that the study of social stratification and social mobility within the military is uninteresting and unimportant. However, upon closer inspection one finds many important features of the stratification system within the military that deserve study. The social origins of the military elite is one of these features.

The interest in the social origins of the military elite in general, and the Army elite in particular, is two-fold. First, the Army is a social organization that is highly bureaucratized and formalized. It publicly states that advancement to high levels of prestige and rank is attributed to excellence in performance as evaluated by universalistic criteria. Theoretically anyone is eligible to join the Army and has the potential to rise to the top. Those who do reach the top should do so because of achieved characteristics, not ascribed ones. This is particularly important in a democratic society such as the United States. Due to the large influence (both direct and indirect) of the military elite upon public policy and the allocation of resources, it is important that the military elite does not represent the interests of a special class but rather those of the society as a whole. This should mean that the social origins of the elite of the Army, and the military in general, should be, to an extent, representative of the

social origins of the people in society. A study of the social origins and the ascribed characteristics of those who have risen to elite positions in the Army would provide the opportunity to determine if those who have risen to elite positions are homogeneous in respect to ascribed characteristics. While the Army supposedly uses universal criteria for advancement, it may be the case that only those with certain ascribed characteristics are truly recruited, considered for advancement, and/or able to advance. If certain ascribed characteristics can be determined to be associated with elite status, then they should be studied to determine the effect of these characteristics on the attainment of education, training, choice of schools, and other assets which one may acquire before entering the military but which may affect advancement within the military.

Second, ^{the} study of social origins of the military elite should interest those in the field of stratification and mobility in that it would provide an important data base for comparing military elites with other professional elites. The social origins of "typical" elites from various professions should be compared to see if certain ascribed characteristics are associated with elite status in our society and if so, further studied to determine how they lead to attainment of elite status.

Third, the study of the social origins of the military elite (as well as any elite) is important for understanding

the members of the elite. Their social origins have an impact on their values, beliefs, and attitudes. To understand fully an elite, not only must their present situation be studied but also their past situation must be known. Additionally, by knowing the background of the various elites, possible conflicts between the two can be better understood.

This thesis addresses
This paper will address the issue of whether members of the Army elite have homogeneous social origins and if not, to what extent they are representative of the general population. *7-1-1*

II.

LITERATURE REVIEW

As stated in the introduction, the study of the military intensified after World War II. An extensive literature search, though, turned up little on the social origins of the military elite and even less that used recent data. Many books and articles were written in the late 1950's and early 1960's. One of the first books that looked at the military elite is C. Wright Mills', The Power Elite(1956). Mills is one of several sociologists who believes that the military has grown not merely in size but in power. Mills states that the military elite is one of three elite groups that together forms the ruling elite of the United States. This book, as well as other books and articles, focuses attention on the military and especially on the elite of the military--the general officer corps. While Mills does study the military elite he does not study the social origins and early backgrounds of the military elite because he feels that they are not important in considering the influence of the military elite. Rather Mills believes that it is their position within society that are important (Mills, p. 192).

Several books were written in the late 1950's and early 1960's which dealt with the subject of civil-military relations and the professional soldier. Two of the most important are The Professional Soldier(1960) by Morris

Janowitz and The Soldier And The State(1953) by Samuel P. Huntington. An additional book, Social Attitudes of American Generals, 1848-1940(1979) by Richard Brown, came out later but was written in 1951. Huntington proposes a theoretical framework for civil-military relations. While the current U.S. military elite is discussed at length, the social origins of the current U.S. military elite are ignored although the social origins of earlier military elites(and other countries) are discussed.

Social Attitudes of American Generals, 1848-1940(1979) by Richard C. Brown does discuss the social origins of the military elite. Published in 1979, the book is a rewrite of his 1951 doctoral dissertation for the history department at The University of Wisconsin. Brown uses the four hundred and sixty-five men who were U.S. general officers from 1848 to 1940 as his population. He determines their social origins and compares them to the social origins of U.S. business and political elites. Brown finds that the South and rural areas are overrepresented by general officers and that there are few foreign-born officers. He does not attempt to determine which social strata their parents belonged to but believes they were middle class and he finds ninety-one percent were Protestant. He characterizes general officers as white, Anglo-Saxon, Protestant, and native-born. In his population sixty-eight percent were academy graduates, twenty-four percent were direct appointments, and six percent were promoted from the ranks(none were Reserve Officer Training Corps graduates). The main part of Brown's book, however,

group consists of those officers born from 1936 to and including 1945. They are compared with data from the 1940 U.S. Census.

Some information is available for all 456 members of the population. When discussing this group it will be referred to as the 1984 population. When discussing one of the two cohorts within the population they will be referred to as the 1984 population (1930 cohort) or the 1984 population (1940 cohort). When discussing the respondents to the questionnaire, they will be referred to as one of the following: the 1984 respondents, the 1984 respondents (1930 Cohort) or the 1984 respondents (1940 Cohort).

When using the 1930 or 1940 census data, the figures used are those for native white males under five years of age. This is used to ensure an accurate comparison with those similar in sex, race, and age at the elite's time of birth. When using the 1980 census white males between the ages of 45 and 60 are used as the comparison group.

Once population parameters (percentages) are determined, a Chi Square test is performed to determine if the respondents are the same as the population parameters. The null hypothesis is rejected if the critical value of the Chi Square test has a probability of less than .05. The following formula is used:

$f(oj)$ =observed frequency

$f(ej)=Np(j)$ =expected frequency

$$\sum_j \frac{[f(oj)-f(ej)]^2}{f(ej)} = \chi^2 \quad \begin{matrix} J-1 \\ \text{degrees of freedom} \end{matrix}$$

worker or farm and educational level of less than high school; with the rest of the sample in the middle. The middle includes all border groups and therefore is biased to be the largest.

Other indicators of social origins and social characteristics of Army elites not used directly by Janowitz but analyzed here include: Father's Education(#16), Mother's Education(#16), Mother's Occupation(#14), Spouse's Education(#11), Spouse's Occupation(#10), and Marital Status(#8 and #9). Data on Source of Commission(#25), Military History(#12), Year of Commission(#26), Geographic Affiliation(#38), Political Orientation(#42), Political Party(#41), Sex(#44), and Race(#45) are discussed by Janowitz in other parts of his book or as important but are not explicitly part of the chapter on social origins. These too are analyzed in this study. These variables are used to describe the characteristics of the present Army elite.

ANALYSIS

The data collected are compared to several other sets of data. Depending on the data being compared one of the following data sets is used: Janowitz's tables in Chapter Five, 1930 census, 1940 census, or the 1980 census. To insure accurate comparisons with the census data, the population and/or sample is divided into two groups for some of the analyses. The first group consists of those officers born from 1925 to and including 1935. This group is at times compared with data from the 1930 U.S. Census. The second

All responses other than these states were classified non-South or they were not included(i.e., foreign born). Only those officers responding to the survey were analyzed for size of place born, but all officers were analyzed on the region they were born in as those data were available from resumes.

Religion was measured by the responses to Question 4, "What is your religious preference?". The responses were coded in several ways to match the different categories used by Janowitz in his analysis. These comparisons include the categories of Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, Other and None as well as Protestant by denomination and Catholic. (The frequency of attendance of religious services was also ascertained, in Question 5)

Social Stratum was the hardest to specify. Questions 13, "What was your father's occupation at the time of your entry into the Army?"; 15, "How would you classify the income of your parents in relation to most Americans?(at the time of your entry into the Army)"; and 16, "What was the educational level of your father when you entered the Army?" were used to indicate a respondent's social stratum. Because of the difficulty of accurately reproducing Janowitz's assignment (which was done subjectively in the context of an interview), the respondents were divided into three groups. The groups are upper stratum, which includes upper 1/3 income, occupations of manager or business or professional and four years of college or more; lower stratum which includes lower 1/3 income, occupations of

in your family was the first to come to the U.S.?". Janowitz used the categories of Foreign-born, First-generation, and Second-generation or later. The responses to Question 3 correspond to Janowitz's in the following manner: Yourself equals Foreign-born; Your Parents equals First-generation; and Your Grandparents and Further Back equals Second-generation and later.

Geographical background was measured by using responses from Question 2, "Where were you born?" and Question 6, "How would you classify the size of the place where you lived when you were born?". These were used to compare with Janowitz's categories of rural versus non-rural background and South versus non-South. Those who responded to Question 2 with Farm, Open Country or Non-Metropolitan Place under 2,500 were designated rural (as they are in the census) and those who responded with any other category were designated non-rural. 1940 and 1950 census definition of region was used to code responses to the question of where the respondent was born into those from the South and those from the North and from the West (not from the South). The South region is defined as follows:

South Atlantic - Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, West
Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina,
District of Columbia, Florida and Georgia
EastSouth Central- Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama,
Mississippi
West South Central-Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Texas

A second mail follow-up was not conducted because of the already high response rate and the belief that additional responses would not be enough to offset the delay in starting the analysis. A cut-off date had been established for the last date to accept responses and this date was rapidly approaching. The belief was that those who had not responded did not want to respond and that another follow-up letter would probably not change their minds. Another possibility was that they were retired and therefore felt they should not or would not respond to a questionnaire directed to active-duty officers.

Once the questionnaires were returned, the service resumes were spot checked against the questionnaires. For those officers who had not returned a questionnaire, information from their service resumes was recorded and used for some analyses (e.g., source of commission).

VARIABLES and SPECIFICATION

Social origin was indicated by nativity, geographical background, religion, and social strata. The specific questions asked are not the same that Janowitz used; however, the responses were combined or coded to be as similar to the categories that Janowitz used as was possible. This was done to insure compatibility with Janowitz's data for comparison. When using different indicators of social origins or different specifications of an indicator this will be noted.

Nativity was measured from responses to Question 3, "Who

addressed for return and postage-paid. A follow-up letter (Appendix B) was sent to each population member 10 days after the questionnaire was mailed. This letter thanked the officer for his/her assistance and urged any officer who had not filled out and returned the questionnaire to do so. The response rate for the questionnaire was 71%. Of the 324 returned, 7 were returned incomplete. Another follow-up letter (Appendix A) was sent to these officers requesting that they complete the questionnaire and return it, which they all did. Two questionnaires were returned that were completed by persons other than the addressee or mutilated to the point that the respondent could not be identified. These were not counted as returned.

Only two officers explicitly refused to complete the questionnaire. The first officer stated that he did not believe he could respond without prior approval from Department of the Army. The second officer stated that he did not want to respond because he believed studies such as this were too often sensationalized and not useful to the Army in any way. A colonel from the Army Military Personnel Center did call to ascertain the reason for the study and to question if it was sponsored by the Army. He had received several calls from General Officers inquiring about the questionnaire. He was satisfied with the responses given him and stated that he would pass the information along. He did say that he saw no reason that the officers could not participate if they so chose.

services, with over four hundred (456 as of May 1984) active-duty general officers.

The names of the generals were provided by the General Officer Management Branch(Military Personnel Center). It provided a social roster of all active-duty officers in the rank of COL(P) to General. The roster contains the name, rank, date of birth, branch, and current address of each officer. Among other interesting information it provided was a service resume on each of these officers. The service resume contains the name of the officer, date and place of birth, years of service, military schools attended, civilian educational degrees, dates of promotion, and source of commission. These resumes provided a source to spot check the accuracy of survey responses and provide at least partial information on all 456 officers in the population.

DATA COLLECTION

A questionnaire (Appendix A) was designed and mailed to each active duty Army general officer, at the initial address obtained from the General Officer Management Branch. Although military personnel must always complete a change-of- address card when moving, each envelope was stamped with "Address Correction Requested" to ensure that I would receive a new address for anyone who had changed duty station.

A cover letter (Appendix B) told the officer the purpose of the survey and requested that he/she help by completing the questionnaire. The questionnaire was

IV

RESEARCH DESIGN

POPULATION

The population of this study is all active-duty (as of May 1, 1984) Army officers in the rank of Brigadier General (to include those Colonels selected for promotion to Brigadier General) to General. These four ranks(BG, MG, LTG and GEN) constitute the apex of the Army officer corps and therefore the elite. (A list of the population may be obtained from the author.)

The Army elite was chosen over the other services or a combination of all four services for several reasons. First, the Army has in the past been the service most representative of the general population (Janowitz,1960) and therefore, if certain ascribed characteristics of the Army military elite are prevalent, one can generalize some of the findings to the services as a whole. Second, as an active-duty U.S. Army officer myself, I am familiar with the Army organization. This greatly facilitated my access to information about all the active-duty generals. Once I was able to link up with the proper office in the Army Personnel Branch, I was able continually to update my information on the population. Third, I believe my name and rank on the cover letter helped to produce a high response rate (over 70%). Fourth, the Army is the largest branch of the

III

HYPOTHESIS

The null hypothesis I will test is that the U.S. Army elite is representative of the U. S. population in regards to social origins. At the same time I will try to determine if Janowitz's prediction that the social origins of the U.S. military elite would broaden and become more representative of the general society has come true. I will use the same indicators of social origin that Professor Janowitz chose. These include nativity, geographical background, religion and class stratum.

general officer corps there are a varying number of general officers from other sources. These sources include Officer Candidate School(OCS), Reserve Officer Training Corps(ROTC), and Direct Appointment. The number varies due to many factors, the greatest being whether the U.S. was at war during the previous twenty years prior to the time being studied. During times of conflict(Korean War, Vietnam) the number of officers on active duty and the number of officers recruited yearly increases greatly. The importance of combat as a factor for advancement and retainment increases and non-academy graduates have a greater chance of remaining on active duty and advancing. Even if all general officers were academy graduates, however, problems with data based on this source alone would still exist. It is extremely hard to justify the statement that the social origins of a large number of cadets (usually the freshman class) represent the much smaller select group of former cadets that twenty-five to thirty years later make up the general officers' ranks.

This paper presents the findings of a study done to determine if the social origins of the Army elite are representative of the general population and if not, if they have become more representative than in previous times, as predicted by Janowitz in The Professional Soldier.

military elite. Many follow up Huntington's and Janowitz's predictions with respect to civil-military relations and the influence of the military elites on society. More recently those studying the area of civil-military relations have been more interested in the democratization and the political attitudes of all military personnel in general and the officer corps in particular, but again they usually ignore the social origins of the officer corps.

There are two problems with many of the works that do discuss the social origins of the military elite. First, some works that discuss social origins use data that Janowitz and others collected in reference to the social origins and political attitudes of the military elite. These data are still being cited as support or proof of hypotheses being advanced, even though the data are over twenty years old. The work by Kourvetaris and Dobratz is a good example of someone using Janowitz's old data. Their data on the military elite origins are not updated. Second, those researchers who do use more recent data usually rely on data about the social origins of U.S. Military Academy cadets to contrast with Janowitz's data. These data are readily available and therefore often used. The rationale is that most general officers are academy graduates and therefore the social origins of the cadets show what the social origins of the present and future military elite will be. Intuitively, this seems valid but there are several problems.

Although academy graduates are over-represented in the

Mylander studies 491 Army general officers on duty as of August 1, 1973. The main point of the book is to study the Army and the careers of the active duty generals at that time. She uses interviews, observation, and archival research to gather information about the Army and the elite. Her study, to an extent, updates Janowitz's data but she looks at only a few of the social origin indicators that Janowitz used and never compares them directly. The findings include that most members of the military elite are from towns with a population of under 25,000 and that the majority are from northern states. She finds that there has been an increase of general officers from Officer Candidate School and Reserve Officer Training Corps sources.

George Kourvetaris and Betty Dobratz in Social Origins and Political Orientations of Officer Corps in a World Perspective take a comparative look at the military elite of the major groupings of countries(i.e., First World, Second World, and Third World). Although data of some individual countries are used, they do not look at specific countries' elite in detail. Using Janowitz's data and a 1959 survey of officers(both over 10 years old at the time) they determine that the social origins of the U.S. officer corps are middle class and white collar. They also find that rural areas are overrepresented.

With these few exceptions, much of what is written today deals with civil-military relations or the military as an organization and ignores the social origins of the

portions of his book, not only to describing the social origins but also to showing how and why knowing the origins of the military elite are important. Using Brown's data, as well as other sources including his own survey and interviews, he does an historical comparative analysis using the years of 1910, 1920, 1935, and 1950 as critical points. He determines that the social origins of the U.S. military elite are homogeneous, remaining basically the same from 1910 to 1950.

According to Janowitz, members of the military elite were almost entirely native born and most were second or later generation American. Many were from old, established families. Most military elite members were of Anglo-Saxon heritage. They were predominantly Protestant but were moving towards more Catholic representation. However, there were none who were not Christian. The majority were from rural backgrounds and the South was over-represented. Most military elite members were from upper- and middle-class families where the father was a professional. Janowitz predicted that the military elite would move towards representation of the social origins of the general population. He also predicted that nativeness would remain strong while self-recruitment (sons and daughters of military men joining the military) would increase but not to such an extent that greater representation would be hindered.

Two more recent books look at the military elite and to a point discuss its social origins. The Generals by Maureen

discusses the social attitudes of the military elite. Brown's unpublished doctoral dissertation is referred to many times by Janowitz in Chapter Five of The Professional Soldier and Janowitz relies on some of the data collected by Brown in his study of the military elites.

The Professional Soldier by Janowitz describes in detail the American professional soldier (the officer corps). Janowitz outlines the manner in which he conducted his research in the Methodological Appendix. His historical sample was comprised of 760 generals and admirals. He utilized questionnaires and interview results in addition to historical, documentary, biographical and autobiographical sources. It took ten years of individual research to collect the information in the book.

He was interested in studying the professional soldier for several reasons. First, he believes that the civilian perceptions of the professional soldier are incorrect and he wants to correct them. Additionally, while he does not see the military elite as part of a ruling elite, he does feel that political leaders defer to them in technical and military matters and therefore, he believes them to be an important elite. Janowitz takes a long look at the social origins and political orientations of the military elite. He also attempts to predict the future of the military elite.

Of particular interest is his study of the social origins of the military elite. He devotes an entire chapter (Chapter Five, "Social Origins"), as well as other

V

FINDINGS

SOCIAL ORIGINS COMPARISON

NATIVITY. The nativity of the military elite has changed but it is still significantly different from the general population. The percentage of foreign-born officers in this sample is greater than the percentage of foreign-born military elite in Janowitz's.(see Table 1) Whereas Janowitz found two percent(2%) of all military elite and one percent(1%) of the Army elite to be foreign-born, three percent(3%) of the respondents were foreign-born. This

TABLE 1

	1984 Respondents	[Janowitz's Data]			b 1980 Census
		1950 Army	1950 Military	a 1959-60 USMA	
Foreign-born	3	1	2	1	6.2

N=315

(Percentages)

Sources:a) The Professional Soldier
b) 1980 U.S.Bureau of the Census

percentage is significantly different from Janowitz's data and indicates a trend towards greater representation of the general population. When compared to whites of comparable age in the 1980 census, however, there is a significant difference between the general population percent of six and

two-tenths(6.2%) and the sample percent of three(3%). Even though the percentage of foreign-born officers has increased, it still is less than one would expect if the military elite were representative of the general population. This indicates that the military elite are in fact less varied in their nativity than the general population.

GEOGRAPHIC BACKGROUND. When using the definition of rural as towns with a population of less than 2,500 and farm, there is overrepresentation of non-rural areas. This is the opposite of the finding by Morris Janowitz. Approximately 69% of the respondents come from non-rural settings versus the 33% in Janowitz's sample.(see Table 2) This is a significant difference. Even if compared to the total U.S. population of 1930 (instead of only those under five years of age) the 1930 sample still shows a significant difference between the sample and the general population (68.9% vs 56.2%) Thirty-six percent come from suburbs of large cities or central cities of over 50,000 and another 18% come from towns with a population of 10,000 to 49,999. This means that over 54% of the respondents come from towns with a population of over 10,000. Therefore the increasing size of towns does not adequately explain the increase in the percentage of elite from non-rural areas but rather a trend towards individuals from non-rural areas attaining elite status. Some caution, though, in claiming this is needed in that the respondents may have listed the size of

the town where they were born (e.g., hospital town) rather than where they actually lived.

TABLE 2

RURAL vs NON-RURAL

	1984 Respond. 1984 <u>Respond. Cohort</u>	1984 Respond. 1930 <u>Respond. Cohort</u>	1930 Census 1930 <u>Census Pop.</u>	1930 Census Total <u>Census Pop.</u>	1984 Respond. 1940 <u>Respond. Cohort</u>	1940 Census 1940 <u>Census</u>	Jan- owitz <u>Data</u>
Rural	31.4	31.1	49	43.8	32.8	50.9	66
Non-Rural							
Total	68.5	68.9	50.9	56.2	67.2	49.1	33
2,500- 9,999	14						
10,000- 49,999	18.3						
50,000- or Suburb	36						
	N=318	257			N=61		

(Percentages)

The second part of geographic background is the region where the 1984 respondent was born. Table 3 shows the division between South and non-South and Table 4 divides the respondents into four regions. The division is by census definition. The South - non-South distribution of the 1984 population matched the 1984 respondents' distribution, therefore supporting the use of the 1984 respondents' data in generalizing results to the 1984 population of General Officers in other areas. The South is overrepresented in the population as it was in Janowitz's sample. The breakdown by region shows that while the South is overrepresented, the

North Central region is underrepresented. This may be because of the limited number of military installations in the region and a resulting lack of exposure to the military in this region when compared to the South.

TABLE 3

SOUTH vs NON-SOUTH

	<u>1984 Population</u>	<u>1984 Population 1930 Cohort</u>	<u>1930 Census</u>	<u>1984 Population 1940 Cohort</u>	<u>1940 Census</u>	<u>Jano- witz 1950 Army</u>
Non-South	56.5	56.6	69.5	55.5	67.9	66
South	43.5	43.4	30.5	44.4	32	34

N=434

(Percentages)

TABLE 4

REGION

	<u>1984 Population</u>	<u>1984 Population 1930 Cohort</u>	<u>1930 Census</u>	<u>1984 Population 1940 Cohort</u>	<u>1940 Census</u>	<u>Jano- witz 1950 Army</u>
North-East	24.9	24.8	28.1	26.7	24.8	23
North-central	23.5	24.2	33.1	21.1	32.2	37
West	7.6	7.6	8.3	7.7	10.9	6
South	44	43.3	30.5	44.5	32	34

N=434

N=339

N=90

(Percentages)

RELIGION. There is a significant difference between this study and Janowitz's study with respect to religious affiliation (see Table 5). Although Protestants are still overrepresented, the difference between the Army elite and

the general population has decreased significantly. The percentage who report themselves as being Protestant decreased from 89% to 70%. This is approaching the results of the 1982 Gallup Report (No 201-202) which reported a general population percentage of 59%. The percentage of Catholics (24.8% up from 11%) is very near the 28% reported by the Gallup Report. The percentage of Jewish and Other has also risen from zero to close to the general public. Even though

TABLE 5
RELIGION

	1984 Respondents	Janowitz 1950 Army	Gallup Report 1982
PROTESTANT			
Traditional	32.2	63	12
Episcopalian	16.3	40	2
Other	16.0	23	10
Pietistic	27.6	18	29
No Denomination	10.3	8	29
Total Prot	70.2	89	59
CATHOLIC	24.8	11	28
JEWISH	0.9	-	2
OTHER	3.1	-	4
NONE	0.6	-	7

N=319

TRADITIONAL - Episcopalian, Presbyterian, Congregationalist
Lutheran, and Evangelical
PIETISTIC - Baptist, Methodist, Disciples of Christ

the elite is more representative of the general population in regards to religious affiliation, overall the categories of None and Catholic are still underrepresented. Within the

category of Protestant, the Episcopalian denomination has lost its dominance. The percentage of elite who reported Episcopalian has dropped from 40% to 16.3%. Other Protestant denominations as well as other religions (e.g., Catholics, Jewish, and Other) are now more often reported. This means that one can no longer use traditional Episcopalian beliefs and ethics to explain the ethics of the elites as Janowitz did.

SOCIAL STRATUM. According to the results of this study, there has been an increase in the percentage of those from the category I defined as the lower class to obtain elite status in the Army. While Janowitz reported only 5% of the elite were from the lower class, 13.5% of the elite in 1984 are from the lower class. (Table 6)

TABLE 6
SOCIAL STRATUM

	1984 Respondents 1930 <u>Cohort</u>	1984 Respondents 1940 <u>Cohort</u>	1984 <u>Respondents</u>	Janowitz 1950
UPPER	0.4	0.3	0.38	3
MIDDLE	88	78.4	82.7	92
LOWER	11.6	21.3	13.5	5
	N=258	N=61	N=319	

(Percentages)

The number who reported their fathers' occupation as "worker" increased from 11% to 22.4%. (see Table 7) There is a decrease in the number of members of the elite whose fathers were in the business and manager categories but this may be due in part to the fact that Janowitz did not use a career military category as this study did (10.6 reported this category). Even though there was an increase in the number from the lower class, the middle class still provides the majority of the elite. The increasing number of lower class combined with the decreasing number of upper class backgrounds shows a trend toward greater representation.

TABLE 7

FATHER'S OCCUPATION

	1984 Respondents	Janowitz 1950 Army
Business	9	29
Manager/Professional	25.5	45
White Collar	11.8	10
Worker	22.4	11
Farmer	7.8	5
Military	10.6	-
Other	12.8	-
	N=321	

OTHER INDICATORS OF SOCIAL ORIGIN

AND CHARACTERISTICS OF THE ARMY ELITE

Janowitz, in other parts of his book, looked at characteristics of the military elite other than what he called the social origins of the elite. These included the source of commission, history of military service by parents, geographic affiliation, political party affiliation, political orientation, education, sex and race. These characteristics helped to identify a typical elite member and provided a basis for understanding the elite. The respondents of this study can also be discussed in relation to these categories. (see Table 8)

Whereas in 1950 the elite was all white and male, the 1984 elite is 94% white, 4% black, and 3% other. It is 99% male. Less than 3% of the elite members consider themselves liberal while 31% consider themselves to be moderate and 66% consider themselves conservative. The party affiliation of the 1983 sample is 10% Democratic, 49% Republican, 34% Independent and 7% other. Only 20% say they are affiliated with the South, another 7% are southeastern or southwestern, and 3% are "American". Those that changed their affiliation over time did so mainly (73%) because of assignment or exposure to the new area. The source of commission for the 1984 population is 36% United States Military Academy, 46% Reserve Officer Training Corps, 11% Officer Candidate School, 6% Direct Appointment, and 1% National Guard or Reserves. This is a significant departure from earlier times when Academy graduates made up the largest percentage of the

TABLE 8
OTHER CHARACTERISTICS

Sex-Male	99	Source of Commission	
Race		ROTC	46
White	94	USMA	36
Black	4	OCS	11
Other	3	Direct Appointment	6
		National Guard/ Reserve	1
Political Orientation			
Conservative	66		
Moderate	31	Undergraduate Degree	99.3
Liberal	3		
Party Affiliation		Civilian Graduate School	92
Republican	49		
Democratic	10	Married	97
Independent	34		
Other	7		
		Father - Careerist	12.4
Regional Affiliation			
South	20	Father or Spouse's	
Southwest/Southeast	7	Father - Careerist	18
American	3		

Education of	Less Than	4 Yr.	MA or PhD
	High School	College	or Equiv.
Father	35	17	11
Mother	23	13.3	2
Spouse	-	38	13

Occupation of	Housewife	Teacher	Nurse	Secretary
Spouse	80	6	3	-
Mother	74	7	2	2

elite. Eighteen percent of the elite members' fathers or elite members' spouse's fathers were career military and 12.4% of the elite members' fathers only were career

military. Only 0.7% (3/456) of the elite did not have an undergraduate degree, which was a decrease from the 1950 sample. In addition, over 92% had attended graduate school at a civilian institution, thereby making this a highly educated elite.

Characteristics that Janowitz did not consider, but which are considered in this study, include marital status, spouse's occupation and education, father's education, and mother's education and occupation. (see table 8) Of the respondents, over 99% are or have been married. At the time of the survey 97% were married with only 8% no longer married to their original spouse. Over 80% of the spouses list their occupation as housewife, with 9% identifying themselves as teachers or nurses. The spouse's educational level is quite high with 38% having four years of college, 13% with MA or PhD equivalent, and none with less than a high school degree. The elite's spouses are well educated but few are employed. This is most likely due to the conservative nature of the elite and the requirement for constant moving.

The father's educational level for the 1984 respondents is: 35% with less than a high school degree, 17% with four years of college, and 11% with a MA or PhD equivalent. The mother's educational level is 23 % with less than a high school degree, 13.3% with four years of college and only 2% with a MA or equivalent degree. The mother's occupation is mainly housewife (74%), teacher (7%), nurse (2%) or secretary(2%).

VI

CONCLUSION

The null hypothesis, that the U.S. Army elite is representative of the U.S. population with regards to social origins, is not supported. In the area of nativity, the Army elite has a significantly smaller percentage of foreign-born members than the U. S. population. The southern region of the country is overrepresented and the northcentral region is underrepresented by the elite when comparing place of birth. More members of the elite have a non-rural background than the population as a whole. A middle class background is overrepresented by the elite. Only in the area of religion does the Army elite come close to being representative of the population, and even here there are some significant differences.

While the null hypothesis is not supported, Janowitz's prediction that the social origins of the elite would become more representative of the population is in fact coming true. There are fewer foreign-born officers than there should be for the military elite to be representative of the population, but the proportion is increasing. The elite has come close to being representative of the population in terms of religion. Not only has the Army elite become more representative of the population in terms of geographic background, but they are also now overrepresentative of the non-rural areas rather than the rural areas. At the same

time, the U. S. population is moving to non-rural areas. Finally, with regards to social stratum, the Army elite is becoming more representative of the population due to the increase in the number of elite members who come from lower or working-class backgrounds, when compared to Janowitz's data.

It is important to note that there may be a relationship between the decrease in traditional religious affiliation and the decrease in upper social class. The upper class has been associated with the traditional religions and the lower class with some of the other religions that are now better represented. There is no way to determine if the change in religious preference is the result of change in the social class origins of the elite members or vice versus. The important point is that the trend in social class towards more lower-class background and the trend in religious affiliation away from traditional Protestant complement each other. The two trends together signify a move of the elite away from upper class affiliation and towards greater representation.

The Army elite does have more homogeneous social origins than the U. S. population in general. The reasons for this are not addressed in this study but some hypotheses can be suggested. First, as with any group, self recruitment plays an important part. An individual selects a career in the Army and then decides whether to remain or not. If an individual is too different from other members of the Army, he/she probably would not stay. Second, due to the constant

moving from place to place and job to job, that an army career demands, individuals may be selected for a position based on their compatibility with those in higher positions. Therefore, those who are similar to existing elite members may receive assignments that are more desirable and thus remain in the Army. Finally, because of the homogeneity in social origins, individuals may find the Army a comfortable and safe place to live and work when compared to other occupations.

Not only are the members of the Army elite less representative of the U.S. population, they are also different from other homogeneous elite groups. Ladd and Lipset (1973) found that members of the academic elite are more liberal and less religious than the general population. Lichtner and Rothman (1981) found that the mass media elite are mainly from the Northeast and North Central regions (68%), over 50% claim no religious affiliation, a majority are liberal, and over 80% are affiliated with the Democratic party. Others have studied the political elite, business elite (Warner, 1952), and other elite groups. By learning as much as possible about these elite groups, including present beliefs and past social backgrounds, a better understanding of their present and future relationships can be obtained. For example, by knowing that the academic and mass media elites are very liberal and have social origins that are different from the military elite, the conflict between them and the conservative military elite can be better

understood. An attempt to alleviate some of the conflict between them and ensure a functioning relationship between them has a better chance of success if these factors are taken into account.

This study determines only that the social origins of the Army elite are not representative of the U. S. population. Even though moving towards greater representation, the Army elite will probably never be completely representative of the general population. More study is required to determine how the social origins of an individual affect the higher probability of his/her selecting a given profession and also how they affect his/her chances of advancement within a particular profession. Additional study is also needed to determine what effect their social backgrounds have on their beliefs, values, and attitudes when dealing with other elites, once an individual becomes an elite member.

Snyder, William P. "Officer Recruitment for the All-Volunteer Force: Trends and Prospectives." Armed Forces and Society 10(1984): 401-425.

Spencer, Gary. "Methodological Issues in the Study of Bureaucratic Elites: A Case Study of West Point." Social Problems 21 (1973): 90-103.

United States Bureau of the Census. 1930. Population Volume III, Part 1. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

_____. 1940. Population Volume I: Number of Inhabitants. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Printing Office.

_____. 1940. Population Volume II: Characteristics of the Population. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Printing Office.

_____. 1940. Population Volume IV: Characteristics by Age. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Printing Office.

_____. 1975. Historical Statistics of the United States. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Printing Office.

_____. 1980. Population Volume I: Chapters A, B and D. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Printing Office.

_____. 1984. A Statistical Abstract of the United States 1984. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Printing Office.

Walton, George, The Tarnished Shield. New York: Dodd, Mead and Co., 1973.

- Ladd, Everett Carl, Jr. and Lipset, Seymour Martin, Academics, Politics, and the 1972 Election. Washington, D.C.: American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, 1973.
- Lichtner, S. Robert and Rothman, Stanley. "Media and Business Elites." Public Opinion 4(1981): 42-60.
- Mazur, Allan, Julie Mazur and Caroline Keating. "Military Rank Attainment of a West Point Class: Effects of Cadets' Physical Features" American Journal of Sociology 90(1984): 125-150.
- Mills, C. Wright, The Power Elite. New York: Oxford University Press, 1956.
- Moskos, Charles C., ed., Public Opinion and the Military Establishment. Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications, 1971.
- Mylander, Maureen, The Generals. New York: The Dial Press, 1974.
- Priest, Robert F. and Houston, John W. New Cadets and Other College Freshmen Class of 1980. West Point, New York: United States Military Academy, 1977.
- Reissman, Leonard. "Life Careers, Power and the Professions: The Retired Army General." American Sociological Review 21 (1956): 215-221.
- Segal, David R. "Selective Promotion in Officer Cohorts." The Sociological Quarterly 8 (1967): 199-206.
- Segal, David R. and Willick, Daniel H. "The Reinforcement of Traditional Career Patterns in Agencies Under Stress." Public Administration Review 28 (1968): 30-38.

REFERENCES

- Brown, Richard C., Social Attitudes of American Generals, 1898 - 1940. New York: Arno Press, 1979.
- Cailleteau, Francois. "Elite Selection in the French Army Officer Corps." Armed Forces and Society 8 (1982): 257-274.
- Fitzgerald, John A. "Changing Patterns of Officer Recruitment at the U.S. Military Academy." Armed Forces and Society 8 (1981): 111-128.
- Huntington, Samuel P., The Soldier and The State. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1957.
- Janowitz, Morris, Sociology and the Military Establishment. Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications, 1974.
- Janowitz, Morris. "Consequences of Social Science Research on the U.S. Military." Armed Forces and Society 8 (1982): 502-524.
- . The New Military: Changing Patterns of Organization. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1967.
- . The Professional Soldier. Glencoe: The Free Press, 1960.
- Kourvetaris, George A. and Dobratz, Betty A., Social Origins and Political Orientation of Officer Corps in a World Perspective. Denver, Colorado: University of Denver, 1973.

September 24, 1984

Sir;

Thank you for taking the time to complete and return my survey. Upon reviewing your survey I discovered that question(s) - on page(s) were not answered. If this was done intentionally please disregard this letter. If the questions were accidentally omitted please complete them on the enclosed survey and return it to me. Again, thank you for your assistance.

Randall D. Chase
CPT, FA
326-48-6694

July 27, 1984

Sir:

I want to thank you for taking the time to fill out my survey on general officers. My experience in graduate school is that there is a lot of talk about the military but unfortunately little research. Professor Janowitz and Professor Charles Moskos both agree that too little is being done about the study of the relationship between the armed forces and society. I hope to increase our understanding with the results of this survey and other research.

If by chance you have not yet returned your survey, please take time to do so. My thesis will only be as good as the material I am able to gather. If by chance you did not receive a survey, please let me know. You can contact me by phone at 919-962-1007 or send me a short note with your correct address, and I will send you another copy.

Again, thank you for your cooperation.

Randall D. Chase
CPT, FA
326-48-6694

APPENDIX B

LETTERS SENT TO POPULATION

July 13, 1984

Sir:

I am writing to request your assistance. I am an active-duty captain and I am currently attending the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. Upon completion of my schooling I will be an instructor in the Behavioral Science and Leadership Department at the United States Military Academy at West Point. I am conducting the enclosed survey as research for my MA thesis on the general officer corps. I would greatly appreciate it if you would take just a few moments to fill out this survey and return it to me.

The data will be utilized for several purposes. First it will be the basis for my MA thesis. Second, it will be the starting point for further research. Last, and probably most importantly, it will be compared to data collected by Morris Janowitz and presented in his book, The Professional Soldier, published in 1960. Professor Janowitz is interested in finding out what changes have occurred in the last twenty-five years.

All data collected will be aggregated before presentation. Your responses will not be used in association with your name. The survey is numbered for accountability purposes only. A high return rate is needed to insure accuracy and in reporting averages and trends. You may be assured of complete confidentiality. Your name will never be placed on the questionnaire.

Thank you in advance for taking the time to assist me.

Randall D. Chase
CPT, FA
326-48-6694

GENERAL INFORMATION

38. Did (Do) you consider yourself a:(Check appropriate box)

North- South- East- West- Midwest- Other
erner erner erner erner erner erner (Specify)

1. WHEN ENTERED ARMY

2. NOW

39. Why did you consider yourself in that category when you entered the Army? (Circle one)

1. BORN THERE
2. GREW UP THERE
3. WENT TO SCHOOL THERE
4. LIVED THERE
5. OTHER _____

40. If you changed categories over time, why? _____

41. In respect to political parties, do you consider yourself a: (Circle one)

1. DEMOCRAT
2. REPUBLICAN
3. INDEPENDENT
4. OTHER (Specify) _____

42. How would you classify your political views?(Circle one)

1. VERY CONSERVATIVE
2. SOMEWHAT CONSERVATIVE
3. MODERATE
4. SOMEWHAT LIBERAL
5. VERY LIBERAL

43. For whom did you vote in 1980? (Circle one)

1. REAGAN
2. CARTER
3. OTHER
4. DID NOT VOTE

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND ASSISTANCE!
JUST STAPLE OR TAPE THIS QUESTIONNAIRE TOGETHER AND DROP IT
INTO A MAILBOX. IT IS ALREADY STAMPED AND ADDRESSED.

35. Why do you feel you were selected for advancement to general officer in the Army? (Check block for each reason)

Not Somewhat Import-
Important Important ant Critical

1. EDUCATION

2. COMMAND EXPERIENCE

3. OER'S

4. CONTACTS

5. ALTERNATE SPECIALTY

6. COMBAT EXPERIENCE

7. OTHERS (Specify)

36. What qualities do you look for in junior officers?
(List from most important to least important)

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

4. _____

5. _____

37. What do you plan to do when you retire? _____

31. What is the highest military school you have completed
and in what year did you complete it?
(School) _____ (Year) _____

32. List the number of months of experience you have in the
following areas:

- | | | |
|-------------------|----------|-------|
| 1. COMMAND | (Months) | _____ |
| 2. COMBAT | | _____ |
| 3. ADMINISTRATION | | _____ |
| 4. LOGISTICS | | _____ |
| 5. TECHNICAL | | _____ |

33. Why did you join the Army? (Circle and Rank: 1=Highest)

- | | | |
|----------------------------|--------|-------|
| 1. MONEY | (Rank) | _____ |
| 2. SECURITY - JOB | | _____ |
| 3. PATRIOTISM - WARTIME | | _____ |
| 4. PATRIOTISM - PEACETIME | | _____ |
| 5. EXPERIENCE | | _____ |
| 6. FULFILL REQUIREMENT | | _____ |
| 7. RETIREMENT BENEFITS | | _____ |
| 8. PROMOTION OPPORTUNITIES | | _____ |
| 9. OTHERS (Specify) _____ | | _____ |
| _____ | | _____ |
| _____ | | _____ |

34. Why did you stay past your initial commitment?
(Circle and Rank: 1 = Highest)

- | | | |
|----------------------------|--------|-------|
| 1. PAY | (Rank) | _____ |
| 2. SECURITY | | _____ |
| 3. SATISFACTION WITH WORK | | _____ |
| 4. CHALLENGE | | _____ |
| 5. PATRIOTISM | | _____ |
| 6. RETIREMENT BENEFITS | | _____ |
| 7. PROMOTION OPPORTUNITIES | | _____ |
| 8. OTHERS (Specify) _____ | | _____ |
| _____ | | _____ |
| _____ | | _____ |

23. What were your reasons for selecting your undergraduate institution? (Circle and Rank: 1 = Highest)

- | | |
|--------------------------------|--------------|
| 1. PRESTIGE | (Rank) _____ |
| 2. ACADEMIC STANDING OF SCHOOL | _____ |
| 3. COST CONSTRAINTS | _____ |
| 4. LOCATION | _____ |
| 5. ONLY CHOICE | _____ |
| 6. OTHERS (Specify) _____ | _____ |
| _____ | _____ |
| _____ | _____ |

24. Do you have any civilian graduate schooling? (Circle one)

- | | |
|--------|----------------------|
| 1. NO | |
| 2. YES | School _____ |
| | Degree _____ |
| | Major _____ |
| | Year Completed _____ |

MILITARY SERVICE DATA

25. What was the source of your commission? (Circle one)

- | | |
|---------------|------------------------------|
| 1. WEST POINT | 4. CIVILIAN MILITARY ACADEMY |
| 2. ROTC | 5. DIRECT APPOINTMENT |
| 3. OCS | 6. LINE COMMISSION |
| | 7. OTHER (Specify) _____ |

26. In what year were you first commissioned? _____

27. In what year did you (or will you) obtain the rank of BG? _____

28. What is your present rank? _____

29. What was your primary/control branch? _____

30. What were your secondary/alternate specialties? _____

16. What was the education level of: (Check appropriate box)

Less
Than High Some 4 Year MA, Law Ph.D., MD
HS School Col Degree (Equiv.) (Equiv.)

1. FATHER _____

2. MOTHER _____

EDUCATIONAL DATA

17. Do you have an undergraduate degree?

1. YES

2. NO (Skip to Question 24)

18. From what institution did you receive your undergraduate degree? _____

19. How would you classify this institution at the time you were there? (Circle one)

1. US MILITARY ACADEMY

2. PRIVATE MILITARY ACADEMY

3. STATE COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY

4. PRIVATE COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY

5. BUSINESS COLLEGE

6. OTHER _____

20. In what year was your undergraduate degree obtained?

21. What type of degree did you earn? (Circle one)

1. BA

2. BS

3. OTHER (Specify) _____

22. What was your major? _____

10. What is your spouse's occupation? _____

11. What is the highest level of education your spouse has completed? (Circle one)

1. NON HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATE
2. HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATE
3. SOME COLLEGE
4. 4 YEAR COLLEGE
5. MASTERS OR EQUIVALENT (i.e. law)
6. PH.D. OR EQUIVALENT (i.e. MD)

12. Have either of your parents or your spouse's parents (if you are currently married) ever been in the military? (Circle one)

1. NO
2. YES (Please fill in chart below)

Relationship	Service (Army, Navy, etc.)	Highest Rank Obtained	Years In Service
--------------	-------------------------------	-----------------------------	---------------------

Father_____

Mother_____

Spouse's Father_____

Spouse's Mother_____

Questions 13-16 refer to your parents' situation at the time of your entry into the Army.

13. What was your father's occupation? _____

14. What was your mother's occupation? _____

15. How would you classify the income of your parents in relation to most other Americans? (Circle one)

1. UPPER ONE-THIRD
2. MIDDLE ONE-THIRD
3. LOWER ONE-THIRD

6. How would you classify the size of the place where you lived when you:

1.	2.	3.
WERE	WERE IN	ENTERED
BORN	HIGH SCHOOL	THE ARMY

Farm, Open Country

Non Under 2,500
Metropolitan 2,500-
Place 9,999
10,000-
50,000

Suburb of City
Larger Than
50,000

Central City
Larger Than
50,000

7. What was the main occupational base of the place where you lived when you: (Check appropriate blocks)

1.	2.	3.
WERE	WERE IN	ENTERED
BORN	HIGH SCHOOL	THE ARMY

Agricultural

Manufacturing

Commercial

Services

(Gov't)

(Schools, etc.)

Military

8. Are you or have you ever been married?

1. NO (Skip to Question 12)
2. YES

9. Are you still married to your first spouse?

1. YES

2. NO Why?

1. Death of spouse, not remarried
(Skip to Question 12)
2. Divorce, not remarried
(Skip to Question 12)
3. Death of spouse, remarried
(Continue to Question 10)
4. Divorce, remarried

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE MAILED TO THE OFFICERS

INSTRUCTIONS:

Your answers to these questions will be kept confidential. NONE of the reports from this study will contain your name. Please answer all the questions to the best of your ability. If you wish, you may write any comments you have on the back page.

The following is an example of the type of question you will be asked, and how to mark the answer.

Sample Q. Was your father in the military? (Circle one)

1. NO
2. YES What branch of Service? _____

BACKGROUND

1. In what year were you born? _____

2. Where were you born? (Circle one)

1. OUTSIDE THE USA country _____

Were you born a U. S. citizen? 1. YES _____
2. NO _____

2. IN THE USA state _____

3. Who in your family was the first to come to the U. S.?

1. YOURSELF
2. YOUR PARENTS
3. YOUR GRANDPARENTS
4. FARTHER BACK THAN GRANDPARENTS

4. What is your religious preference? (Circle one)

1. PROTESTANT (Specify denomination) _____
2. JEWISH
3. CATHOLIC
4. OTHER (Specify) _____
5. NONE

5. How frequently did you attend religious services in a place of worship during the past year? (Circle one)

1. REGULARLY (once a week or more)
2. OCCASIONALLY
3. ON SPECIAL DAYS (Christmas, Holy Days, etc.)
4. NEVER

END

FILMED

7-85

DTIC